REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-5 remain in the application.

In item 3 on pages 2-5 of the above-mentioned Office action, claims 1 and 3-5 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Hara (US Pat. No. 5,498,902) in view of Inaba (US Pat. No. 4,258,381) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

As will be explained below, it is believed that the claims were patentable over the cited art in their original form and the claims have, therefore, not been amended to overcome the references.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claim 1 calls for, inter alia:

> a lead frame having an island with a base area supporting said integrated circuit, a ratio between the base area of said integrated circuit and the base area of said island being from 0.7 to 0.9 for avoiding flexure of said housing;
>
> said integrated circuit and said island embedded in said housing so that a thickness of a housing region above said integrated circuit is substantially equal to a thickness of a housing region below said island. (Emphasis added.)

Hara describes the manufacture of an electronic component for achieving a higher integrative density of an integrated circuit and for avoiding the component defects or component failures due to raised heat development. However, Hara does not provide any hint toward the area ratio according to the invention of the instant application. Similar to the argument presented in Applicants' response dated July 18, 2002 in response to the Office action dated April 18, 2002 with regard to Lim et al., Fig. 11 of Hara is not a true-to-scale representation of the actual ratio. Hara also does not disclose that the thickness of the housing region above the integrated circuit is substantially equal to the thickness of the housing region below the island, as recited in claim 1 of the instant application.

As already discussed in Applicants' response dated July 18, 2002 in response to the Office action dated April 18, 2002, an area ratio of about 0.973 may be calculated according to the information disclosed in column 4, lines 45-58 of Inaba. This ratio is not within the range 0.7-0.9 as recited in claim 1 of the instant application. Inaba does not contain any hint or suggestion that the ratio disclosed therein can be changed to avoid deformation. A person skilled in the art would not be able to combine Hara and Inaba and reach the range as recited

in claim 1 of the instant application without any inventive activities such as purposed research.

The Examiner has stated that it is a matter of routine experimentation to determine or select the area ratio. However, it is noted that "[t]he mere fact that the prior art could be so modified would not have made the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification." *In re Gordon*, 221 USPQ 1125 (1984). None of the cited prior art references teaches or suggests the desirability to modify the area ratio between the base area of the integrated circuit and the base area of the island to the range of 0.7-0.9.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 1. Claim 1 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In item 4 on page 6 of the above-mentioned Office action, claim 2 has been rejected as being unpatentable over Hara in view of Inaba and further in view of Lim et al. (US Pat. No. 5,773,878) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

As discussed above, claim 1 is believed to be patentable over the art. Since claim 2 is dependent on claim 1, it is believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-5 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made. Please charge any fees which might be due with respect to 37 CFR Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

LAURENCE A. GREENBERG
REG. NO. 29,308

For Applicants

YC

March 4, 2004
Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101